



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/691,264	10/22/2003	Jesse D. Crum	2003-10	5445
7590 01/06/2009				
Ward/Kraft, Inc. Attn: Stephanie Hay 2401 Cooper Street P.O. Box 938 Fort Scott, KS 66701			EXAMINER BATTULA, PRADEEP CHOUDARY	
			ART UNIT 3725	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/06/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/691,264

Applicant(s)

CRUM, JESSE D.

Examiner

PRADEEP C. BATTULA

Art Unit

3725

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 October 2008.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6 and 21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 6, 21 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This is a fourth non-final action in response to the reply filed on October 8, 2008

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 21 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lalande in view of Good, Rea, and MSDS.

Lalande teaches of a method of making a sheet of dry removable die cut tags 13 (Column 2, Lines 28 – 30, 41 – 49; Figure 1, Item 13) comprising providing a laminate consisting of a sheet of tag material (capable of being substantially UV transparent material) 16 and a carrier sheet 11 with the sheets being bonded to each other with adhesive 14 substantially over the entire surface (Column 2, Lines 15 – 28) and wherein when the tags are removed there is no adhesive on the tag (Column 2, Lines 23 - 24, 41 - 49).

Lalande does not disclose a carrier sheet of substantially UV-transparent material bonded to the laminate with UV curable adhesive and creating a frangible bond and die-cutting said sheet of tag material to form tags having a major portion and a minor portion fully contained within, but fully separated from, said major portion; and exposing said UV-curable adhesive to ultraviolet radiation through said carrier sheet, said ultraviolet radiation being of such a nature as to cause said adhesive to frangibly

adhere to said tag material sheet; whereby upon removing said major portions of said tags from said laminate, said major portion separates from said laminate free of adhesive but said minor portion remains adhered to said carrier sheet.

Good discloses hang tags each of said tags having a major portion and a minor portion 15, with said major portion 16 having a surface area greater than the surface area of said minor portion (Figure 1, Items 15, and 16) and wherein upon removal of said major portion from said first layer, said minor portion does not remain adhered to said first layer but is meant to be removed from the first layer (Column 3, Lines 61 – 65). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the tags of Lalande with major and minor portions in order to allow for the tags to be hung on a particular item.

Lalande modified by Good does not disclose a carrier sheet of substantially UV-transparent material bonded to the laminate with UV curable adhesive and creating a frangible bond and exposing said UV-curable adhesive to ultraviolet radiation through said carrier sheet, said ultraviolet radiation being of such a nature as to cause said adhesive to frangibly adhere to said tag material sheet; whereby upon removing said major portions of said tags from said laminate, said major portion separates from said laminate free of adhesive but said minor portion remains adhered to said carrier sheet.

Rea discloses a label having UV curable adhesive 4 wherein the adhesive is cured through a substantially UV top layer/carrier sheet 2 protecting and opposite of an indicia bearing face stock (Column 6, Lines 11 - 16; Column 7, Lines 5 – 12) which is able to allow UV radiation to pass through and allow for the adhesive to cure and create

a label arrangement with a face stock 6 (Column 6, Lines 11 – 24, Column 7, Lines 21 – 34; Figure 1, Items 2,4,6) and carrier 2. Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the adhesive and teachings of curing such adhesive as taught by Rea in order to provide Lalande with UV curable tags wherein when placing the top ply of labels one can readjust the top ply in case of error and then cure the adhesive.

Lalande modified by Good and Rea does not disclose wherein the major portion separates from said carrier sheet from of adhesive.

The previously provided MSDS teaches that the adhesive used by applicant was known at the time the invention was made and through the specification is UV cured and forms a completely frangible bond (both surfaces dry) upon a label being removed from a carrier. Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the adhesive of Rea with the adhesive of the MSDS because the substitution of one known element (the UV adhesive of the MSDS) for another (the UV adhesive of Rea) would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention since the substitution of the UV adhesive of the MSDS would have yielded predictable results, namely, a tamper indication in the label of Rea and maintaining the same intent of Lalande of having no adhesive on the tag when removed from the base ply.

In regards to Claim 6, Lalande modified by Good, Rea, and MSDS does not explicitly teach of the carrier having a thickness of not more than about 7 mils however it

is very well known in the art of hang tags and labels that carrier sheets are less than 7 mils.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 21 and 6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

With respect to the use of Rea, the actual teaching of curing UV curable adhesive through a top sheet is being used.

With respect to the use of the MSDS, Applicant's specification shows that individuals outside of the Applying party were aware of the adhesive and its properties. The MSDS teaches that such was shown well before the application's submission.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PRADEEP C. BATTULA whose telephone number is (571)272-2142. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thurs. & alternating Fri. 7:00AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dana Ross can be reached on 571-272-4480. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/P. C. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 3725
December 23, 2008

/Dana Ross/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3725